

REMARKS

The rejections of Claims 7-10 and 21-30 as being unpatentable over JP '268 in view of JP '743 and of Claims 7-10 as being unpatentable over Tatsumi et al. in view of JP '743, both under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), are traversed. Reconsideration of those rejections is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Although the Office Action correctly acknowledges that the JP '268 connecting method does not disclose preliminary and plastic bonding marks remaining on the integrated bonded body, it asserts that the bonding marks appear to be part of the forming method. There is, however, no evidence of record from which such an inference can be drawn.

Also, with regard to the JP '743 document, the Office Action appears to characterize the teachings therein so as to equate grooves or projections formed around the spindle shaft with preliminary bonding marks and plastic flow marks. Such a conclusion is, however, completely incorrect. That is, the marks are different from the grooves or projection. As seen in Figs. 14 and 15 of the present application, the preliminary bonding mark 7 are at an end face of the hub and not between the hub and the shaft.

The JP '743 shaft in no way employs a preliminary and plastic bonding marks, particularly as there is no suggestion whatsoever that a two-step bonding process is employed. The grooves or projections formed around the shaft are not such marks, and the same can be said about the shaft and hub arrangement disclosed in the JP '268 document where only plastic bonding is carried out. Even assuming the teachings from both these documents would have been combinable, the resulting combination would not have been that defined by the claims of this application.

Similarly, even though the Office Action acknowledges that the Tatsumi et al. rotor does not teach the presence of bonding marks in the bonded body, it asserts --again without a foundation in the record-- that "these appear to be part of the forming method," notwithstanding the other acknowledgement that this reference does not disclose preliminary and/or plastic bonding marks on the bonded body. For reasons already set forth and also because of the amendments to the claims, even the hypothetical combination of Tatsumi et al. and JP '743 would not yield the present invention.

In summary, the Office Action does not set forth a prima facie case of obviousness. Accordingly, early and favorable action is earnestly solicited. In the event, however, that the Examiner has any remaining questions before


further action in this case, the undersigned would appreciate the opportunity to have a personal interview with the Examiner in an effort to reduce issues and streamline prosecution.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #056208.52811US).

Respectfully submitted,

October 31, 2007



James F. McKeown
Registration No. 25,406

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
JFM:jeh